

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

November 7, 2000 - 2:00 PM

Stratton Hall - Room 102

ATTENDEES: Curtis, Dickerhoff, Frost, Kidnay, Klusman, Lu, Navidi, Nickum, Ohno, E. Pang and Wendlandt

APOLOGIES: Readey

VISITORS: President John Trefny

ANNOUNCEMENT (Pang) – ASCSM would like send a representative to the Faculty Senate meetings on a regular basis. The Senators had no objections to this request. Pang will invite ASCSM to send a representative to the next Senate meeting.

COMMENTS FROM GUEST:

A. Trefny

1. Barbara Olds was appointed Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs. She will begin January 1, 2001. One of her responsibilities will be the Handbook Committee. She will be stepping down as Director of the McBride Honors Program. There will be an interim director for this program for the 2001 spring semester.
2. The Promotion and Tenure Committee members will be selected and begin meeting as soon as possible so they can establish this committee's procedures.
3. CSM did spectacularly well with the ABET visit. The team was impressed that CSM extended improvements to include the three programs that were not being evaluated by ABET.
4. Trefny has made three fund raising trips. He has gone to San Francisco, California; White Fish, Montana; and Houston, Texas.
5. Graduate School loses about 150 students in December. There are only about 40 new students coming in for the next semester.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: The minutes of the October 17, 2000 Faculty Senate meeting were approved. Pang reminded the Senators to inform their departments that the minutes are on the CSM web site. The Senate web address is "mines.edu/Faculty_staff/senate/".

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

A. Executive Committee (E. Pang) – Barbara Olds will chair the Compensation Committee. Pang will contact the six members (David Matlock, John DeSanto, Vaughan Griffiths, Wendy Harrison, Tom Furtak, Gary Olhoeft) of last year's committee and see if they would like to serve on this committee for another year. Pang will forward their responses to Olds.

Trefny started this committee three years ago as an ad-hoc committee. He would like it to become part of the Faculty Affairs Committee.

B. Councils of the Senate

1. Graduate Council (Klusman) – The following courses were approved to be cross-listed: Chem Engineering 584 and a new course, Geology 500.

The remainder of the meeting was spent discussing the decline of graduate enrollment with Phil Romig.

2. Undergraduate Council (Nickum provided the following written report)

Several courses were approved and introduced. Of note, EPICS252 Leadership Design was up for approval and while it passed unanimously, the Council members asked for a name change to better represent the content of the course.

Mark Linne presented a proposal for a 5-year combined Chemistry and Engineering Curriculum. This would be structured similarly to the PHIEG program. The Council will discuss this in future meetings.

Nigel Middleton distributed an article "Earth Systems Engineering: The World as Human Artifact" by Brad R. Allenby. It will be useful when making changes to SYNG101, Earth Systems Engineering.

3. Research Council (Ohno) – Discussed a memo from Phil Romig on the changes in ORS and the changes in their responsibilities.

NOTE: The Senate discussed the need for a central location to archive documents. Nickum will see if there is space in the library and report back to the Senate

C. Faculty Senate Committees

1. Committee on Committees (Readey) – No report.
2. Faculty Affairs (Ohno) – Committee has not met.
3. Academic Standards and Policies (Kidnay) – Committee has not met.
4. Evaluation (Klusman) – This committee requests the Senate discuss in detail the following memo:

March 6, 2000

To: Faculty Senate
From: Ron Klusman, for the Evaluation Committee
Subject: Report to the Senate on Student Evaluation of Faculty

The Evaluation Committee of the Faculty Senate met on January 14 and February 18, 2000 to consider the process for the student evaluation of faculty. This continued the effort of the Committee under Chet Van Tyne to consider possible changes in the process. In the time period between these meetings, a survey was taken of Department Heads about their use of optional questions beyond the 14 in the core, and their use of the results in the evaluation of the teaching performance of their faculty.

The results of the survey do not suggest unanimity in support of use of the current system. Some doubt the validity of the entire process, others feel that it does provide useful data. Department heads appear to weight the summary results of the faculty/course forms at 20-70 in their evaluation of teaching performance.

There are mixed opinions among the Evaluation Committee that favor two possible options:

- 1) continue the current system, with no changes in process and no changes in questions,
- 2) give the Kansas State University (IDEAS) system another opportunity, considering it may have matured in the approximately 20 years since it was last used at CSM.

Arguments for the KSU system include:

- a) more complete information about the scientific validity of the questions and the process,
 - b) flexibility in questions is still there,
 - c) the question order is carefully determined in order to reduce bias on following questions,
 - d) a comparison is possible for similar courses at other institutions; for example, harder courses such as calculus or statics may receive lower evaluations than easier courses.
- This observation can be compared for similar courses at other institutions.

Arguments against the KSU system include:

- a) CSM coordinator will still be needed,
- b) a request would likely have to be made to the Budget Committee.

Department Heads Questionnaire

Dear Department Head,

The Faculty Senate is discussing the possible revision of the process for student evaluation of faculty. The primary issues are the effectiveness of the process, the stock you place in the results in your evaluation of teaching quality, and the possible administrative problems and "costs."

Your prompt reply to this questionnaire will be appreciated.

_____ Department

Ronald W. Klusman
Chemistry and Geochemistry
for the Evaluation Committee

1. Do you currently use optional questions beyond the 14 in the core for the standard student evaluation of faculty and courses?
2. Do you use the same questions for all faculty and courses? If "no" do you use the same set for tenured faculty?

If "no" do you use the same set for untenured faculty?
3. In light of the new faculty evaluation system which moves away from numeric scores, would you favor increasing the number of "core" questions and eliminating the optional questions? Strongly agree to strongly disagree.
4. Is the current form scientifically valid in your opinion? Strongly agree to strongly disagree.
5. Are the results from the form your primary vehicle for the evaluation of faculty teaching?

Percentage of your teaching evaluation of faculty?

6. The current form is heavily weighted toward the evaluation of the faculty member. Would you favor increasing the proportion of the questions toward evaluation of the course?
7. Do high scores reflect faculty popularity and easy grading?
8. Would you like to see questions that provide information on the profile of the individual student and his/her expectations?

9. Do you, or your departmental secretary have difficulty getting faculty to submit their list of optional questions to be included in the form?
3. Sports and Athletics (Wendlandt) – The Committee is in the process of interviewing 35 athletes whose eligibility ends this semester.
4. Readmissions (Wendlandt) – Committee has not met.

D. University Committees

1. Budget (Dickerhoff) – The Committee met twice last month. At the first meeting, the committee worked on a report to the State on CSM's expenditures of the State's \$49 million portion of the \$90 million budget.
2. At their second meeting, Bill Young, Director of Admissions, explained a computer program that is used to determine total financial aid awards to students.
3. Handbook (Pang) – This committee will meet for the first time this semester on November 8th.

E. Presidential Search Advisory Committee (Readey provided the following written report)

DATE: November 3, 2000
TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Dennis W. Readey
SUBJECT: Report on Presidential Search Advisory Committee

The Presidential Search Advisory Committee (PSAC) has been meeting weekly and interviewing the various vice presidents, students, graduate students, staff, and Pete Steinhauer who chaired the last two presidential searches at CU-Boulder. The main focus has been to get inputs from the various constituencies on criteria for the presidential candidates. Based on these inputs and discussion among the Committee members, the following criteria have been established.

Leadership

- Ability to develop, articulate, and implement a clear vision for Colorado School of Mines by integrating the historical mission with the opportunities of the future.
- Capability and passion to be a strong institutional voice for the School, both internally and externally.
- Understanding of the unique academic enterprise at Colorado School of Mines, with a strong commitment to students, scholarship, intellectual activity, and the expansion of the School's research programs.
- Capacity to integrate the historical strengths of the School as they relate to current and future higher education issues and trends.
- Proven leadership, decision-making, and diplomatic qualities, with an established reputation for integrity and fairness.

Management

- Strong executive skills with a demonstrated commitment to effective communication methods, sound human and financial resource practices, creative problem-solving, and calculated risk taking.
- Documented success in cultivating and soliciting philanthropic funds and in leading a major fund-raising effort.

Relationships

- Proven success in building and maintaining strong external relationships, with an appreciation of the importance of working cooperatively within the governance structure of the State of Colorado.
- Demonstrated ability in listening and working with different constituencies, particularly students, faculty, and staff.
- Accomplishments that reflect a commitment to equity and diversity in higher education.

Academic Experience

- National and/or international reputation in engineering, science, or education.
- Ability to strengthen undergraduate and graduate education and research, to expand and reinvigorate key academic areas, and to build collaboration between departments.
- Strong demonstrated commitment to academic excellence.

An advertisement has been developed and will appear on November 17th in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and in three education publications for women and minorities. The ad may also be sent to The Economist and to The Wall Street Journal cost permitting. In addition, a color brochure giving a synopsis of CSM has been developed and is being printed. This will be sent out to all those contacted about the position.

There have been about 40 internal and external candidates nominated by various individuals both on and off campus. These individuals and a list provided by the search consulting firm, Korn-Ferry, will be sent a letter and the brochure making them aware of the position and soliciting their applications. It is anticipated that serious evaluation of resumes will begin after the first of the year. There is also discussion about personally contacting certain key candidates (as yet unidentified) to encourage their application. How this will be accomplished and how the list will be determined is not clear. According to Pete Steinhauer, this is the only way that CSM will get the president it really wants.

I think that it might be good if the Senate were to spend an entire meeting (or at least, a major part of one) discussing what the faculty would like to see in the candidate and questions that might be asked of the candidates when we get around to interviewing them. I am supposed to represent the faculty through the Senate on this Committee, so the inputs of the Senate are extremely welcome and encouraged.

This report will be discussed at the next meeting when Readey is present.

OLD BUSINESS:

- A. Senior Senator Vacancy - The Senate unanimously approved the appointment of Tissa Illangasekare, Environmental Science and Engineering Division, to fill the unexpired term of Senior Senator, Jim Ely.

NEW BUSINESS:

- A. Long-term Strategic Plan for CSM – The Academic Planning Council is discussing this.
- B. Financial implication of increased enrollment of undergraduate and graduate students – Due to time, this will be discussed at a future Senate meeting. At the next meeting, the two main agenda items will be (1) the qualifications and search process for the new president and (2) a university senate versus a faculty senate structure at CSM.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 PM